arXiv:1701.04796v2 [math.PR] 8 Feb 2017

REPULSION IN LOW TEMPERATURE β-ENSEMBLES

YACIN AMEUR

Abstract. We prove a result on non-clustering of particles in a two-dimensional Coulomb plasma, which holds provided that the inverse temperature β satisfies $\beta > 1$. As a consequence we obtain a result on crystallization as $\beta \to \infty$: the particles will, on a microscopic scale, appear at a certain distance from each other. The estimation of this distance is connected to Abrikosov's conjecture that the particles should freeze up according to a honeycomb lattice when $\beta \to \infty$.

Consider a large but finite system of identical point-charges $\{\zeta_i\}_1^n$ in the plane $\mathbb{C}$, in the presence of an external field nQ, such that $Q(\zeta)$ is "large" near $\zeta = \infty$. The system is picked randomly from the Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution at inverse temperature $\beta > 1$,

$$d\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{Z_n^{(\beta)}}\, e^{-\beta H_n(\zeta)}\, dA^{\otimes n}(\zeta), \quad \zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Here H_n is the total energy

$$H_n(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n) = \sum_{j \neq k} \log \frac{1}{|\zeta_j - \zeta_k|} + n \sum_{j=1}^n Q(\zeta_j),$$

$dA = dxdy/\pi$ is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$ divided by π. The constant $Z_n^{(\beta)} = \int e^{-\beta H_n}\, dA^{\otimes n}$ is the so-called partition function of the ensemble.

A random sample $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$ might be termed "Coulomb gas", "one-component plasma", or "β-ensemble". For brevity, we use "system" as a synonym.

It is well-known that the system tends, on average, to follow Frostman's equilibrium measure in external potential Q. The support of the equilibrium measure is a compact set which we call the droplet.

The rough approximation afforded by the equilibrium measure is too crude to reveal details on a microscopic scale. However, it is believed on physical grounds that the particles should be evenly spread out in the interior of the droplet, with a non-trivial behaviour near the boundary - the Hall effect. Everything of importance goes on in the vicinity of the droplet.

In this note, we prove that the distance between neighbouring particles at a given location in the plane is large with high probability. Further, the distance tends to increase with β, and as $\beta \to \infty$, we recover formally the separation theorem for Fekete sets from the papers [1, 6].

Formulation of results

Let $Q : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a suitable function of sufficient increase near ∞; precise conditions are given below. We call Q the external potential.

Let μ be a compactly supported Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{C}$. The weighted logarithmic energy of μ is defined by

$$I_Q[\mu] = \iint_{\mathbb{C}^2} \log \frac{1}{|\zeta - \eta|}\, d\mu(\zeta) d\mu(\eta) + \int_{\mathbb{C}} Q\, d\mu.$$

Assuming that Q obeys some natural conditions recalled below there is a unique compactly supported probability measure σ which minimizes I_Q. This is Frostman's equilibrium measure in external field Q. The support $S = \operatorname{supp} \sigma$ is known as the droplet, and the equilibrium measure takes the form (see [25])

$$d\sigma(\zeta) = \chi_S(\zeta) \Delta Q(\zeta)\, dA(\zeta),$$

where we write $\Delta = \partial\bar\partial$ for 1/4 times the standard Laplacian; χ_S is the characteristic function of the set S.

Remark. Let $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$ be a random sample with respect to $\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}$. Write $\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}$ for the expectation with respect to $\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}$. It is well-known that $\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n f(\zeta_j)] \to \sigma(f)$ as $n \to \infty$ for each continuous bounded function f on $\mathbb{C}$. See [18, 21].

The preceding remark shows that, in a sense, the equilibrium measure gives a first approximation to the macroscopic behaviour of the system. We here want to study microscopic properties. For this, we could fix a point $p \in \mathbb{C}$, which might depend on n, and zoom on it at an appropriate rate. However, for technical reasons it is easier to choose the coordinate system so that $p = 0$. In other words, 0 will in the following denote the origin of an n-dependent coordinate system which can be obtained from some static reference system by rigid motion.

Let $\mathbb{D}_r = \mathbb{D}_r(0)$ denote the disk center 0 radius r. By the *microscopic scale* r_n at 0 we mean the radius such that

$$n \int_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}} \Delta Q\, dA = 1.$$

We allow for any situation such that r_n is well-defined. This is a mild restriction. Indeed, we always have $\Delta Q \geq 0$ on S, since σ is a probability measure. By our assumptions below, this implies that r_n is always well-defined if 0 is in the interior of S. Also, if we have $\Delta Q > 0$ on some portion of ∂S, then r_n is well-defined when 0 is in some neighbourhood of that portion. Since the behaviour of the gas is of interest only in a neighbourhood of the droplet, we can thus essentially treat all cases of interest.

Given a sample $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$, we rescale about 0 and consider the process $\{z_j\}_1^n$ where

$$z_j = r_n^{-1} \zeta_j. \tag{1}$$

We denote by $\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}$ the image of $\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}$ under the map (1) and write $\mathbb{E}_n^{(\beta)}$ for the corresponding expectation. Also let $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_1$ be the unit disk.

Let $\mathscr{F}_n$ be the event that at least one of the z_j falls in $\mathbb{D}$. Denote $\eta_n = \mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\mathscr{F}_n)$. Passing to a subsequence, we can assume that the sequence η_n is convergent. It is perfectly possible that $\eta_n \to 0$, meaning that nothing of interest goes on in the vicinity of 0. (Cf. concluding remarks.) A more interesting possibility is that η_n is bounded below by some positive constant η.

Given a random sample $\{z_j\}_1^n \in \mathscr{F}_n$ we define we define a number s_0 by

$$s_0 = \min_{z_j \in \mathbb{D}} \min_{k \neq j} |z_j - z_k|, \quad (\{z_j\}_1^n \in \mathscr{F}_n).$$

Thus s_0 is the largest rescaled distance from a particle in $\mathbb{D}$ to its nearest neighbour. We refer to s_0 as the *spacing* of the sample, in the vicinity of the point 0.

We are now prepared to formulate our main results. The following result shows that the strength of repulsion tends to increase with β.

Theorem. *Suppose that $\beta > 1$ and fix $n_0 \geq 1$. Then there is a constant $c = c(n_0, \beta) > 0$ such that if $n \geq n_0$, $\eta_n \geq \eta > 0$, and $0 < \epsilon < 1$, then*

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\{s_0 \geq c \cdot (\epsilon\eta)^{\frac{1}{2(\beta-1)}}\} \,|\, \mathscr{F}_n) \geq 1 - m_0\epsilon, \tag{2}$$

where $m_0 = 16c^{-2}(\epsilon\eta)^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}}$. Moreover, given any $\beta_0 > 1$, c can be chosen independent of β when $\beta \geq \beta_0$.

The left hand side in (2) should be understood as a conditional probability given that $\mathscr{F}_n$ has occurred.

The next result gives a kind of crystallization as $\beta \to \infty$.

Corollary. *Suppose that* $\inf \eta_n > 0$ *and* $\Delta Q(0) \geq \text{const.} > 0$. *Let c be any number with $c < 1/(8\sqrt{e})$. Then*

$$\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \liminf_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\{s_0 > c\} \,|\, \mathscr{F}_n) = 1.$$

We obtain Corollary by estimating the best constant c in (2) as $n_0, \beta \to \infty$.

Corollary should be compared with the asymptotic lower bound $1/\sqrt{e}$ for the distance between Fekete points obtained in [1, Theorem 1]. In fact, our method of proof is somewhat related to the approach in [1, 6], see concluding remarks below.

In the present context, Abrikosov's conjecture states that under the conditions in Corollary, the system $\{z_j\}_1^n$ should more and more resemble a honeycomb lattice as $n, \beta \to \infty$. The distance between neighbouring particles in this lattice can be computed, leading naturally to the conjecture that the "right" bound for c in Corollary should be $c < 2^{1/2}3^{-1/4}$. Cf. [1].

Here are precise assumptions to be used in the proofs below: (i) $Q : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is l.s.c.; (ii) the interior of the set $\Sigma := \{Q < \infty\}$ is non-empty; (iii) Q is real-analytic on $\operatorname{Int}\Sigma$; (iv) $\liminf_{\zeta \to \infty} Q(\zeta)/\log|\zeta|^2 > 1$; (v) $S \subset \operatorname{Int}\Sigma$.

In addition, we freely use the following notation: The dA-measure of a subset $\omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ is denoted $|\omega|$. By $\mathscr{W}_n$ we mean the set of weighted polynomials $f = pe^{-nQ/2}$ where p is a holomorphic polynomial of degree at most $n-1$. We denote averages by $\fint_\omega g = \frac{1}{|\omega|}\int_\omega g\, dA$. $\mathbb{D}_r(\zeta)$ denotes the disc center ζ radius r and we write $\mathbb{D}_r = \mathbb{D}_r(0)$.

Proofs of the main results

Suppose that the Taylor expansion of ΔQ about 0 takes the form

$$\Delta Q = P + \text{"higher order terms"}$$

where $P \geq 0$, $P \not\equiv 0$, and P is homogeneous of some degree $2k-2$. The existence of such a P is of course a consequence of the real-analyticity of Q.

Following [8] we write τ_0 for the positive constant such that

$$\tau_0^{-2k} = \frac{1}{2\pi k}\int_0^{2\pi} P(e^{i\theta})\, d\theta.$$

Note that τ_0 can be cast in the form

$$\tau_0^{-2k} = \frac{\Delta^k Q(0)}{k[(k-1)!]^2}.$$

This follows easily by expressing P as a polynomial in ζ and $\bar\zeta$.

Using τ_0, we conveniently express the microscopic scale to a negligible error, as follows

$$r_n = \tau_0 n^{-1/2k}(1 + O(n^{-1/2k})), \quad (n \to \infty).$$

Note that if $k = 1$ then $\tau_0 = 1/\sqrt{\Delta Q(0)}$.

As in [8] we define a holomorphic polynomial H by

$$H(\zeta) := Q(0) + 2\partial Q(0)\,\zeta + \cdots + \frac{2}{(2k)!}\partial^{2k} Q(0)\,\zeta^{2k}. \tag{3}$$

We will also use the dominant homogeneous part of Q at 0, i.e., the function

$$Q_0(\zeta) = \sum_{i+j=2k,\, i,j\geq 1} \frac{\partial^i \bar\partial^j Q(0)}{i!\,j!}\,\zeta^i \bar\zeta^j.$$

The point is that we have the canonical decomposition (cf. [8])

$$Q(\zeta) = \operatorname{Re} H(\zeta) + Q_0(\zeta) + O(|\zeta|^{2k+1}), \quad (\zeta \to 0).$$

Below we fix a large integer n_0. The following Bernstein-type lemma is an elaboration of [1, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $n \geq n_0$. If $f \in \mathscr{W}_n$ and $f(0) \neq 0$ then there is a constant $K = K(n_0)$ such that*

$$|\nabla |f|(0)| \leq K r_n^{-1} \fint_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}} |f|.$$

If $\Delta Q(0) \geq$ const. > 0 then we can take $K(n_0) = 4\sqrt{e}(1 + o(1))$, $(n_0 \to \infty)$.

Proof. Denote $h = \operatorname{Re} H$ where H is the polynomial in (3). Also write

$$q_0 = \sum_{i+j=2k,\, i,j\geq 1} \frac{|\partial^i \bar\partial^j Q(0)|}{i!\, j!}.$$

Since $r_n = \tau_0 n^{-1/2k}(1 + O(n^{-1/2k}))$ we have

$$|\zeta| \leq r_n \quad \Rightarrow \quad n|Q(\zeta) - h(\zeta)| \leq q_0 n|\zeta|^{2k} + O(n^{-1/2k}) \leq C_n, \tag{4}$$

where $C_n = \tau_0^{2k} q_0 + C n^{-1/2k}$.

Now note that

$$|\nabla |f|(\zeta)| = |p'(\zeta) - n\partial Q(\zeta) p(\zeta)| e^{-nQ(\zeta)/2}$$

and

$$\left|\nabla\left(|p|e^{-nh/2}\right)(\zeta)\right| = \left|\frac{d}{d\zeta}\left(pe^{-nH/2}\right)(\zeta)\right|.$$

Inserting $\zeta = 0$ it is now seen that

$$|\nabla |f|(0)| = \left|\frac{d}{d\zeta}\left(pe^{-nH/2}\right)(0)\right|.$$

We now apply a Cauchy estimate to deduce that if $r_n/2 \leq r \leq r_n$ then

$$\left|\frac{d}{d\zeta}\left(pe^{-H/2}\right)(0)\right| = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left|\int_{|\zeta|=r} \frac{p(\zeta)e^{-nH(\zeta)/2}}{\zeta^2}\, d\zeta\right| \leq \frac{2}{\pi r_n^2}\int_{|\zeta|=r} |p|e^{-nh/2}\, |d\zeta|.$$

By (4) the last integral is dominated by

$$e^{C_n/2}\int_{|\zeta|=r} |p|e^{-nQ/2}\, |d\zeta| = e^{C_n/2}\int_{|\zeta|=r} |f|\, |d\zeta|.$$

It follows that

$$|\nabla |f|(0)| \leq \frac{4e^{C_n/2}}{\pi r_n^3}\int_{r_n/2}^{r_n} dr \int_{|\zeta|=r} |f|\, |d\zeta| \leq K r_n^{-1} \fint_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}} |f|,$$

where $K = 4\sup_{n\geq n_0}\{e^{C_n/2}\}$. If $\Delta Q(0) \geq \text{const.} > 0$ then $k = 1$ and $\tau_0^2 q_0 = 1$, which gives $K \leq 4e^{1/2 + C/\sqrt{n_0}}$. □

The weighted Lagrange interpolation polynomials associated with a configuration $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$ of distinct points are defined by

$$\ell_j(\zeta) = \left(\prod_{i\neq j}(\zeta - \zeta_i)/\prod_{i\neq j}(\zeta_j - \zeta_i)\right)\cdot e^{-n(Q(\zeta)-Q(\zeta_j))/2}, \qquad (j = 1, \ldots, n).$$

Note that $\ell_j \in \mathscr{W}_n$ and $\ell_j(\zeta_k) = \delta_{jk}$.

Now let $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$ be a random sample from $\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}$. Then $\ell_j(\zeta)$ is a random variable which depends on the sample and on ζ. In the next few lemmas, we fix an index j, $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Lemma 2. *Suppose that U is a measurable subset of $\mathbb{C}$ of finite measure $|U|$. Then*

$$\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_U(\zeta_j)\cdot\int_{\mathbb{C}}|\ell_j(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\,dA(\zeta)\right]=|U|. \tag{5}$$

Proof. We shall use the following identity, whose verification is left to the reader

$$|\ell_j(\zeta)|^{2\beta}e^{-\beta H_n(\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_j,\dots,\zeta_n)}=e^{-\beta H_n(\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta,\dots,\zeta_n)}.$$

By this and Fubini's theorem, integrating first in ζ_j, we immediately get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{C}}dA(\zeta)\,\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[|\ell_j(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\cdot\chi_U(\zeta_j)\right]\\ =\int_U dA(\zeta_j)\int_{\mathbb{C}^n}d\mathbf{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta,\dots,\zeta_n)=|U|,\end{aligned}$$

proving (5). □

In the sequel, we assume that $n\geq n_0$ and recall the constant $K=K(n_0)$ provided by Lemma 1. We will write $K(n_0,\zeta)$ the same constant with 0 replaced by ζ and let $r_n(\zeta)$ be the microscopic scale at ζ. Finally, we fix a suitable, large enough, constant M; we may take $M=3$ for example.

It is easy to see that there is a constant $T=T(M)\geq 1$ such that if $\zeta\in\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}$ then $T^{-1}r_n(\zeta)\leq r_n(0)\leq Tr_n(\zeta)$. If $\Delta Q(0)\geq$ const. >0 we might take $T=1+o(1)$ as $n\to\infty$.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that $\beta\geq 1/2$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{r_n^2}\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\cdot\int_{\mathbb{C}}|\ell_j(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\,dA(\zeta)\right]=1. \tag{6}$$

Moreover, if $n\geq n_0$, $K=\sup_{\zeta\in\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}}K(\zeta)$, and $r_n=r_n(0)$, then

$$\frac{1}{r_n^2}\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\cdot\int_{\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}}|\nabla|\ell_j|(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\,dA(\zeta)\right]\leq T^{2\beta+4}K^{2\beta}r_n^{-2\beta}. \tag{7}$$

Proof. The identity (6) follows from Lemma 2 with $U=\mathbb{D}_{r_n}$.

To prove (7) we fix a non-zero $f\in\mathscr{W}_n$ and assume that $f(\zeta)\neq 0$ where $\zeta\in\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}$. By Lemma 1 and Jensen's inequality, we have for all $\beta\geq 1/2$ that

$$|\nabla|f|(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\leq K^{2\beta}r_n(\zeta)^{-2\beta}\fint_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n(\zeta)}(\zeta)}|f|^{2\beta}.$$

Applying this with $f = \ell_j$ and taking expectations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\int_{\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}} |\nabla|\ell_j|(\zeta)|^{2\beta}\, dA(\zeta)\cdot \chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\right]\\
&\quad\le K^{2\beta}\int_{\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}} dA(\zeta)\, r_n(\zeta)^{-2\beta-2}\int_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n(\zeta)}(\zeta)} dA(\eta)\,\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\,|\ell_j(\eta)|^{2\beta}\right]\\
&\quad\le T^{2\beta+2}K^{2\beta}r_n^{-2\beta-2}\int_{\mathbb{C}} dA(\eta)\,\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\,|\ell_j(\eta)|^{2\beta}\right]\int_{\mathbb{D}_{Tr_n}(\eta)} dA(\zeta)\\
&\quad= T^{2\beta+4}K^{2\beta}r_n^{-2\beta+2},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6) in the last step. □

In the following, we let z and ζ denote complex variables related via

$$z = r_n^{-1}\zeta.$$

We shall use the random functions ϱ_j defined by

$$\varrho_j(z) = |\ell_j(\zeta)| = |\ell_j(r_n z)|.$$

Thus $\varrho_j(z_k) = \delta_{jk}$ where $\{z_k\}_1^n$ is the rescaled process.

Lemma 4. *Let $\beta \ge 1/2$. Then with notation as above*

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}}(z_j)\,\|\nabla\varrho_j\|^{2\beta}_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)}\right] \le T^4(TK)^{2\beta}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. The inequality (7) says that

$$\frac{1}{r_n^2}\mathbf{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left[\chi_{\mathbb{D}_{r_n}}(\zeta_j)\int_{\mathbb{D}_{Mr_n}} (r_n|\nabla|\ell_j|(\zeta)|)^{2\beta}\, dA(\zeta)\right] \le T^4(TK)^{2\beta}.$$

Rescaling we immediately obtain (8). □

Suppose that $\beta > 1$. We will use Morrey's inequality, which asserts that for all real-valued f in the Sobolev space $W^{1,2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)$, all $z, w \in \mathbb{D}_{M/\sqrt{2}}$, we have

$$|f(z) - f(w)| \le C\|\nabla f\|_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)}|z-w|^{1-1/\beta}. \tag{9}$$

See [11, Corollary 9.12] and its proof. In fact, the proof in [11, p. 283] shows that (9) holds with $C = C_0(1-1/\beta)^{-1}$ where $C_0 \le 2\pi^{1/2\beta}$.

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem.

Recall that $\mathscr{F}_n$ denotes the event that at least one particle hits $\mathbb{D}$ and fix an arbitrary j, $1 \le j \le n$. Assuming that $\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\mathscr{F}_n) \ge \eta > 0$, we deduce from Lemma 4 the following inequality for the conditional expectation

$$\mathbb{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left(\chi_{\mathbb{D}}(z_j)\,\|\nabla\varrho_j\|^{2\beta}_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)} \;\middle|\; \mathscr{F}_n\right) \le \frac{T^4(TK)^{2\beta}}{\eta}. \tag{10}$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and recall that s_0 denotes the distance from a point in $\{z_j\}_1^n \cap \mathbb{D}$ to its closest neighbour, where we assume that $\{z_j\}_1^n \in \mathscr{F}_n$. We must prove that $s_0 \ge c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)}$ with (conditional) probability at least $1-\epsilon$.

For each $\lambda > 0$ we have by Chebyshev's inequality and (10)

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}\left(\left\{\chi_{\mathbb{D}}(z_j)\|\nabla \varrho_j\|^{2\beta}_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)} > \lambda\right\} \;\middle|\; \mathscr{F}_n\right) \le \frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbb{E}_n^{(\beta)}\left(\chi_{\mathbb{D}}(z_j)\|\nabla \varrho_j\|^{2\beta}_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)} \;\middle|\; \mathscr{F}_n\right) \le \frac{T^4(TK)^{2\beta}}{\eta\lambda}.$$

We now set $\lambda = T^4(TK)^{2\beta}\eta^{-1}\epsilon^{-1}$. Pick a sample $\{z_j\}_1^n \in \mathscr{F}_n$ and suppose that $z_j \in \mathbb{D}$. Then $\|\nabla \varrho_j\|_{L^{2\beta}(\mathbb{D}_M)} \le \lambda^{1/2\beta} = T^{2/\beta}(TK)(\epsilon\eta)^{-1/2\beta}$ with probability at least $1-\epsilon$.

Now let z_k be a closest neighbour to z_j. In view of (9) there is another constant $C = C_0(1-1/\beta)^{-1}$ such that, with probability at least $1-\epsilon$, we have either $|z_j - z_k| \ge M/\sqrt{2}$ or

$$1 = |\varrho_j(z_j) - \varrho_j(z_k)| \le CT^{1+2/\beta}K(\epsilon\eta)^{-1/2\beta}|z_j - z_k|^{1-1/\beta}, \tag{11}$$

i.e., $|z_j - z_k| \ge c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)}$ where we may chose

$$c = (CT^{1+2/\beta}K)^{-\beta/(\beta-1)} = (1-1/\beta)^{\beta/(\beta-1)}(C_0T^{1+2/\beta}K)^{-\beta/(\beta-1)}. \tag{12}$$

We have shown that

$$\min_{k\neq j}|z_j - z_k| \ge c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)} \tag{13}$$

with probability at least $1-\epsilon$. The formula (12) shows that c can be chosen independent of β when $\beta \ge \beta_0 > 1$. The proof of Theorem is complete.

Lemma 5. *Let $N_{\mathbb{D}}$ be the number of particles which fall in $\mathbb{D}$. Also define $r_0 = c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)}/2$ and $m_0 = 4/r_0^2$. Then $N_{\mathbb{D}} \le m_0$ and $s_0 \ge c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)}$ with probability at least $1 - m_0\epsilon$.*

Proof. Suppose that at least m particles, denoted $z_1, \dots, z_m$, fall in $\mathbb{D}$. For $1 \le j \le m$ let E_j be the event that the disk $\mathbb{D}_{r_0}(z_j)$ contains no point z_k with $1 \le k \le n$, $k \neq j$. Then $\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(E_j^c) \le \epsilon$, where E_j^c is the complementary event.

We have shown that

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\cap_{j=1}^m E_j) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\cup_{j=1}^m E_j^c) \ge 1 - m\epsilon.$$

It follows that if at least m particles fall in $\mathbb{D}$ then with probability at least $1 - m\epsilon$ there are m disjoint disks of radius r_0 inside $\mathbb{D}_2$. Comparing areas we see that $mr_0^2 \le 4$, i.e., $m \le m_0$. □

The lemma says that if $m_0 = m_0(\beta, \epsilon, \eta) = 16c^{-2}(\epsilon\eta)^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}}$ then

$$\mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\{s_0 \ge c(\epsilon\eta)^{1/2(\beta-1)}\}|\mathscr{F}_n) \ge 1 - \epsilon m_0. \tag{14}$$

This proves Theorem.

Now assume that $\Delta Q(0) \geq \text{const.} > 0$. Then by Lemma 1, the constant K there might be taken as $K = 4\sqrt{e}(1 + o(1))$ while we may take $T = 1 + o(1)$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence $C_0 T^{1+2/\beta} K \leq 8\sqrt{e}(\pi T^4)^{1/2\beta}(1+o(1))$, and so, if $c(\beta)$ denotes the largest constant such that the estimate (13) holds asymptotically, as $n_0 \to \infty$, then $\liminf_{\beta\to\infty} c(\beta) \geq 1/(8\sqrt{e})$ and $\limsup_{\beta\to\infty} m_0(\beta, \epsilon, \eta) \leq 2^{10}e$. It is now clear from (14) that Corollary is a consequence of Theorem.

q.e.d.

Concluding remarks

Consider the quantities $\eta_n = \mathbb{P}_n^{(\beta)}(\mathscr{F}_n)$. It is of interest to know when η_n is bounded below. For this, we form the quantities $\alpha_n = r_n^{-2}|\mathbb{D}_{r_n} \cap S|$. That is, α_n is the fraction of the area of the micro-disc $\mathbb{D}_{r_n}$ which falls inside the droplet S. We conjecture that η_n is bounded below if α_n is bounded below.

More generally, if we fix a positive R and put $\alpha_n^R = (Rr_n)^{-2}|\mathbb{D}_{Rr_n} \cap S|$. It seems plausible that η_n is bounded below if and only if the sequence α_n^R is bounded below for some $R \geq 1$. This has been verified in the determinantal situation $\beta = 1$ in many cases. See the papers [4, 5, 8]. See also [1] for the case $\beta = \infty$. We will return to these matters later [2].

A configuration $\{\zeta_j\}_1^n$ is said to be a Fekete configuration in external potential Q if the energy $H_n(\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_n)$ is minimal. We think of such configurations as frozen particle systems, at temperature $1/\beta = 0$; they are wholly contained in the droplet, see [25]. To our knowledge, uniform separation between Fekete points was first shown in [6].

The analysis of Fekete configurations in [1, 6] depends on the inequality $|\ell_j| \leq 1$ for the associated weighted Lagrange polynomials ℓ_j. This bound plays a similar role when $\beta = \infty$ as the $L^{2\beta}$-estimate in Lemma 2 does in the present case.

The idea of using an $L^{2\beta}$-bound on Lagrange sections occurs in [15]. The context there is different, but in a way, we have elaborated on this idea here.

It is possible to extend Corollary to the "bulk singular case" where $\Delta Q(0) = 0$. However, the constant c must be modified, depending on the dominant terms in the Taylor expansion of ΔQ about 0. This is so because the constants T, K depend on those terms.

In the determinantal case $\beta = 1$, limiting point fields $\{z_j\}_1^\infty$ have been identified in many cases. The study of universality in this setting was initiated in the paper [4]. When $\beta > 1$, the determinantal structure is lost, and the problem of calculating limiting point fields remains a challenge. The question is perhaps especially intriguing when we rescale about a regular boundary point of S, or about some other kind of special point, cf. [5, 7, 24].

At a regular boundary point, it seems plausible that the distribution should be translation invariant in the direction tangent to the boundary, i.e., in a suitable coordinate system, the distribution depends only on $x = \operatorname{Re} z$. The Hall effect is believed to give rise to certain irregularities in the

distribution, which are to be located slightly to the inside of the boundary. See [13] and the references there for a discussion of this fascinating topic. While our results provide more and more information when β gets very large, the results in [13], by contrast, seem to be more accurate when β is close to 1. A corresponding analysis was performed earlier in the bulk in the progenitor paper [19]; see [14, 16, 20, 23] for more recent developments.

In the case of "moderately sized" β, $1 \ll \beta \ll \infty$, neither of the methods seem to give very clear pictures of the situation. However, the paper [12] suggests that a phase-transition ("freezing") should take place after a certain finite value $\beta = \beta_0$. The study of existence and possible size of melting temperature $1/\beta_0$ is currently an active area of research.

It is sometimes useful to consider n-dependent potentials $V_n = Q + h/n$ where Q is as before and h is a fixed smooth function. See e.g. [3, 9, 21]. Our theory generalizes without difficulty to this situation. One can obtain further generalizations by relaxing the assumption of real-analyticity of the underlying potential Q. We leave details to the interested reader

By the "hard edge β-ensemble" in external potential Q, we mean the ensemble obtained by redefining Q to be $+\infty$ outside of the droplet. Cf. [4, 5, 26] for the case $\beta = 1$. The question of spacings in this setting will be taken up elsewhere.

We finally want to give a few remarks pertaining to Ward's identity. This is a relation connecting the one- and two-point functions of a β-ensemble which has been part of the physical mainstream for quite some time. In the present context, it was used systematically by Wiegmann and Zabrodin and their school, and it is an important tool in conformal field theory [22].

In the paper [3], Ward's identity was used to give a relatively simple proof of Gaussian field convergence of linear statistics of a $\beta = 1$ ensemble. Recently in [9] the method was, as it seems, extended to general β-ensembles.

The one-dimensional counterpart to Ward's identity is called the loop equation. It is convenient to use different names depending on dimension; while the two identities are derived in similar ways, they have quite different analytical properties. The loop equation (or "fundamental relation") was used in [19] to study fluctuations in one-dimensional β-ensembles. See [10] and the references for more recent developments in the area.

The microscopic version of Ward's identity was introduced fairly recently in [4]. It is called *Ward's equation*. See [4, Section 7.7] for the general case of β-ensembles. It is natural to ask how Ward's equation fits into the present context. We hope to come back to this later on.

References

[1] Ameur, Y., *A density theorem for weighted Fekete sets*, Int. Math. Res. Notices 2016, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnw161.

[2] Ameur, Y., In preparation.

[3] Ameur, Y., Hedenmalm, H., Makarov, N., *Ward identities and random normal matrices*, Ann. Probab. **43** (2015), 1157–1201. Cf. arXiv:1109.5941v3 for a different version.

[4] Ameur, Y., Kang, N.-G., Makarov, N., *Rescaling Ward identities in the random normal matrix model*. arxiv: 1410.4132v4
[5] Ameur, Y., Kang, N.-G., Makarov, N., Wennman, A., *Scaling limits of random normal matrix processes at singular boundary points*, arxiv: 1510.08723.
[6] Ameur, Y., Ortega-Cerdà, J., *Beurling-Landau densities of weighted Fekete sets and correlation kernel estimates*, J. Funct. Anal. **263** (2012), 1825–1861.
[7] Ameur, Y., Seo, S.-M., *Microscopic densities and Fock-Sobolev spaces*, arxiv: 1610.10052v2
[8] Ameur, Y., Seo, S.-M., *On bulk singularities in the random normal matrix model.* Constr. Approx. **365** (2017), DOI :10.1007/s00365-017-9368-4.
[9] Bauerschmidt, R., Bourgade, P., Nikula, M., Yau, H.-T., *The two-dimensional Coulomb plasma: quasi-free approximation and central limit theorem*, arxiv: 1609.08582
[10] Bourgade, P., Erdős, L., Yau, H.-T., *Universality of general β-ensembles*, Duke Math. J. **163** (2014), 1127-1190.
[11] Brezis, H., *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Springer 2010.
[12] Caillol, J. M., Levesque, D, Weiss, J. J., Hansen, J. P., *A Monte-Carlo study of the classical two-dimensional one-component plasma*, Journal of Statistical Physics **28** (1982).
[13] Can, T., Forrester, P. J., Téllez, G., Wiegmann, P., *Singular behavior at the edge of Laughlin states*, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 235137 (2014).
[14] Can, T., Laskin, M., Wiegmann, P., *Fractional quantum Hall effect in a curved space: gravitational anomaly and electromagnetic response*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 046803 (2014).
[15] Carroll, T., Marzo, J., Massaneda, X., Ortega-Cerdà, J., *Equidistribution and β ensembles*, Annales de la Faculté des Sciences de Toulouse (Mathématiques). (To appear.)
[16] Ferrari, F., Klevtsov, S., *FQHE on curved backgrounds, free fields and large N*, JHEP12 (2014) 086.
[17] Forrester, P. J., *Log-gases and random matrices*, Princeton 2010.
[18] Hedenmalm, H., Makarov, N., *Coulomb gas ensembles and Laplacian growth*, Proc. London. Math. Soc. **106** (2013), 859–907.
[19] Jancovici, B., *Exact results for the two-dimensional one-component plasma*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981), 386-388.
[20] Jansen, S., Lieb, E. H., Seiler, R., *Symmetry breaking in Laughlin's state on a cylinder*, Commun. Math. Phys. **285**, 503-535 (2009).
[21] Johansson, K., *On fluctuations of eigenvalues of random normal matrices*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), 151-204.
[22] Kang, N.-G., Makarov, N., *Gaussian free field and conformal field theory*, Astérisque **353** (2013).
[23] Klevtsov, S., *Random normal matrices, Bergman kernel and projective embeddings*, JHEP01 (2014) 133.
[24] Laskin, M., Chiu, Y. H., Can, T., Wiegmann, P., *Emergent conformal symmetry of quantum Hall states on singular surfaces*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 266803 (2016).
[25] Saff, E. B., Totik, V., *Logarithmic potentials with external fields*, Springer 1997.
[26] Seo, S.-M., *Edge scaling limit of the spectral radius for random normal matrix ensembles at hard edge*, arxiv: 1508.06591.

Yacin Ameur, Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Lund University, P.O. BOX 118, 221 00 Lund, Sweden
E-mail address: Yacin.Ameur@maths.lth.se